

**REMARKS**

In further response to the rejections imposed in the Office Action dated September 28, 2004, and in support of the argument advanced in the ultimate paragraph on page 6 thereof, Applicant submits herewith Exhibit A containing sketches illustrating the advantages of the present invention. Specifically, Fig. 1 of Exhibit A schematically illustrates an embodiment of the present invention wherein the oxidation of the copper wire is prevented from passing the interface because the interface consists of different metals, i.e., aluminum and copper. Fig. 2 of Exhibit A illustrates the advanced oxidation of copper into the device attendant upon a prior art structure. Thus, as pointed out in the December 23, 2004 response, the argued structural differences between the claimed device and the device disclosed by Lee et al. are functionally significant in preventing oxidation of the copper from advancing across the interface.

Based upon the arguments submitted in the December 23, 2004 Office Action, and for the reasons argument submitted herein, Applicant submits that the imposed objection and rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

**Application No.: 10/649,737**

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Arthur J. Steiner

Registration No. 26,106

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 AJS:ntb  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: December 28, 2004**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**

# EXHIBIT A